

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		NG DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/500,227 01/25/2005		/25/2005	Hiroshi Shinbori	2004-1002A	7472
513	7590	06/22/2005		EXAMINER	
	•	& PONACK, L	YOUNG, CHRISTOPHER G		
2033 K STR SUITE 800	EEI N. W.		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
WASHING	ron, dc 2	20006-1021	1756		
				DATE MAILED: 06/22/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

\mathcal{L}							
	Api	plication No.	Applicant(s)				
	10.	/500,227	SHINBORI ET	AL.			
Office Action Summa	ry Exa	aminer	Art Unit				
	Chi	ristopher G. Young	1756				
The MAILING DATE of this con Period for Reply	nmunication appears	on the cover sheet	with the correspondence	address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERI THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COM - Extensions of time may be available under the pr after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of th - If the period for reply specified above is less than - If NO period for reply is specified above, the max - Failure to reply within the set or extended period Any reply received by the Office later than three r earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.70	MUNICATION. ovisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). is communication. thirty (30) days, a reply within mum statutory period will app for reply will, by statute, cause nonths after the mailing date of	In no event, however, may the statutory minimum of the sty and will expire SIX (6) Mo the application to become	a reply be timely filed hirty (30) days will be considered ONTHS from the mailing date of the ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133)	nis communication.			
Status							
1) Responsive to communication	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>25 January 2005</u> .						
2a) This action is FINAL .	2b)⊠ This action	his action is non-final.					
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •							
closed in accordance with the	practice under <i>Ex pa</i>	rte Quayle, 1935 C	.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims							
4) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in 4a) Of the above claim(s) 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected. 8) Claim(s) are subject to Application Papers	_ is/are withdrawn fro						
<u> </u>	hadha Farania						
9) The specification is objected to10) The drawing(s) filed on	•	d or b)□ objected t	o by the Examiner				
Applicant may not request that an	·	, ,	•).			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) inc	=	• -					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		•					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a a) All b) Some * c) None 1. Certified copies of the property of the property of the certified copies of the property of the certified copies	e of: riority documents have riority documents have opies of the priority d rnational Bureau (PC	ve been received. ve been received in ocuments have bee CT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No en received in this Natio	nal Stage			
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Re 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1 sheet. S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 1-04)		Paper N 5) Notice o 6) Other:	v Summary (PTO-413) o(s)/Mail Date f Informal Patent Application Part of Paper No./M				

KK

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 1-8 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-7 of copending Application No. 10/644,737. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because an overcoating composition, and the basic method of utilizing the composition, that contains a water soluble polymer and a water soluble cross-linking agent having at least one nitrogen atom in its structure (the instant application) is encompassed by the over-coating composition, and the basic method of utilizing the composition, wherein the composition contains a polyvinyl alcohol and another water soluble polymer other than polyvinyl alcohol (the 10/644,737).

application). A review of the dependent claims in each application shows a substantial overlap in the two different ingredients of the respective compositions.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

3. Claims 1-8 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-9 of copending Application No. 10/471,772. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because an overcoating composition, and the basic method of utilizing the composition, that contains a water soluble polymer and a water soluble cross-linking agent having at least one nitrogen atom in its structure (the instant application) is encompassed by the over-coating composition, and the basic method of utilizing the composition, wherein the composition contains a water soluble polymer and a surfactant (the 10/471,772 application). A review of the compounds that fall within each category of the respective compositions shows that there is substantial overlap between the water soluble polymer of the instant application and the surfactant of 10/471,772, while the cross-linking agent of the instant application overlaps with the water-soluble polymer of 10/471,772.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chun, US Patent Number 6,486,058.

The instant application is drawn to a method of forming fine patterns comprising: covering a substrate having photo resist patterns thereon made of a photo resist, with an over-coating agent for forming fine patterns, applying heat treatment to cause thermal shrinkage of the over-coating agent so that the spacing between adjacent photo resist patterns is lessened by the resulting thermal shrinking action, and removing the over-coating agent substantially completely. The over-coating composition contains a water soluble polymer and a water soluble crosslinking agent having at least one nitrogen atom in its structure.

Chun discloses a method of forming a photoresist pattern defining a contact hole. A photoresist pattern that defines an opening there through is provided over a semiconductor substrate surface. Then, a layer of water-soluble organic over-coating material (WASOOM) is coated over the photoresist pattern including the opening thereof. Next, the resulting structure is flowed to shrink the size of the opening. After the resist reflow, WASOOM is removed.

Thus, using the methods of the present invention, a photoresist pattern capable of forming a 0.18 .mu.m (and below) contact hole can be formed using an inexpensive conventional optical lithography system. Further, because WASOOM is water-soluble, WASOOM can be substantially completely removed from the photoresist pattern using a simple cleaning process, i.e., water rinse, after baking for resist reflow. Thus, the process steps are simplified and the problems such as the difficulty in CD control and the environmental issues are avoided. Referring to FIG. 3, an insulating layer 22 is formed on the surface of semiconductor substrate 24. Next, to form a photoresist pattern defining a contact hole, a photoresist layer 26, for example, an i-line, Krf or ArF photoresist layer is formed on the insulating layer 22. Then, the photoresist layer 26 is selectively exposed through a photomask (not shown). The exposure of photoresist layer 26 can be performed by ultraviolet (UV) light, iline, deep UV (D-UV), extreme-UV (E-UV), e-beam, or x-ray. Further, the photoresist layer 26 is developed to form a photoresist pattern 26' using a developing solution such as one containing 2.38 tetramethylammonium hydride (TMAH). As a result, a photoresist pattern 26' that defines an opening 28 therethrough is provided over the insulating layer 22.

Subsequently, a resist-reflow buffer layer 30 is coated over the photoresist pattern 26' including the opening 28 thereof to fill the opening. The resist-reflow buffer layer 30 is preferably coated to a thickness of approximately 2000 .ANG. as indicated by dimension T in FIG. 3. In the present invention, the resist-reflow

Application/Control Number: 10/500,227

Art Unit: 1756

buffer layer 30 is formed of a water-soluble organic over-coating material (WASOOM).

Following the coating of WASOOM, the resulting structure is resist-reflowed to shrink the size of the opening 28. The resist reflow is performed by heat treatment techniques, e.g., baking. This step of baking for contact hole shrinking is preferably performed at a temperature of approximately 50-200.degree. C. More preferably, the baking for contact hole shrinking is performed at a temperature of approximately 150-170.degree. C. Most preferably, the baking is performed at 165.degree. C. because it is discovered that there is no iso-dense bias at that temperature. Also, the baking is preferably performed for less than approximately five minutes.

After the resist reflow, WASOOM is removed. Particularly, WASOOM can be almost completely removed by rinsing the resulting structure with a hydrophilic developing solution. Thus, substantially no undesirable reactants are left on the side walls of the photoresist pattern 26". Preferably, the hydrophilic solution can be D1 water, TMAH-containing solution, alkyl alcohol, or mixtures thereof.

Chun clearly describes, teaches and suggests the claimed embodiments of claims 1-8, with the exception of the claimed combination for the over-coating composition, and some of the specific ranges set forth in the dependent claims.

It is held that it is prima facie obvious to combine two compositions each of which is taught by the prior art to be useful for the same purpose, in order to form a third composition to be used for the very same purpose.

It is held that it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges of result-effective variables by routine experimentation. In re Antonie, 559 F.2d 618, 195 USPQ 6 (CCPA 1977). See also In re Boesch, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

It is held that concentration limitations are obvious absent a showing of criticality. Azko v. E.I Du Pont de Nemours 1 USPQ 2d 1704 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have determined the optimum values of the relevant concentration parameters in Chun through routine experimentation in the absence of a showing of criticality.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used a combination of a water soluble polymer and a water soluble crosslinking agent having at least one nitrogen atom in its structure as the aqueous coating solution of Chun with the expectation of providing the desired reduction of dimensions of a resist pattern on a substrate, since Chun teaches that each of them can be used for the same purpose.

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher G. Young whose telephone number is 571-272-1394. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Huff can be reached on 571-272-1385. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Christopher G. Young Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1756